

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed November 5, 2004. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's consideration of the Application. Claim 17 has been canceled, and Claims 1, 24 and 27 have been amended to clarify, more particularly point out, and more distinctly claim inventive concepts previously present in these claims. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case in view of the following remarks.

Section 103(a) Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-5 and 10-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,038,601 to Lambert et al. ("*Lambert*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,409 to Zhang et al. ("*Zhang*"). The Examiner rejects Claims 6-8, 28 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lambert* in view of *Zhang* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,857,188 to Douglas ("*Douglas*"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of *Lambert* and *Zhang* suggested by the Examiner fails to disclose each and every limitation specifically recited in Applicants' independent claims. For example, the *Lambert-Zhang* combination fails to disclose the elements:

(1) "receiving at a data center manager a data change message from a trigger associated with a data source, the data change message generated in response to a change in the data," and "generating an expiration command at the data center manager in response to the data change message" (recited in Applicants' independent Claim 1, as amended);

(2) "receiving at a data center manager, before expiration of the dynamic content item, a data change message from a trigger associated with the dynamic content item," and "generating an expiration command at the data center manager in response to the data change message" (recited in Applicants' independent Claim 24, as amended); or

(3) a "data source operable to generate a data change message in response to a change in data associated with the data source, and the data center manager operable to receive the data change message and generate an expiration message in response to the data change message" (recited in Applicants' independent Claim 27, as amended).

With respect to independent Claim 1, the Examiner states at page 7 of the Office Action that "Lambert et al. teaches . . . receiving at the data center manager a data change message from a trigger associated with a data source . . . and generating an expiration command at the data center manager as a function of the data change message (column 7, lines 55-58 and column 32, lines 12-18)." However, neither of these passages in *Lambert* discloses such limitations. These passages state as follows:

Content that is invalidated is marked as expired in the cache, and the next time the caching server is asked for that content, the caching server knows to retrieve that content from the content owner.

(*Lambert*, column 7, lines 55-58). And:

The caching server solves this problem by assigning each piece of content an expiration date. The server satisfies requests for cached content from local storage until the expiration date is reached, after which time it checks at the origin site to see if the content has changed. The origin site may tell the server what the expiration date is, based on knowledge of the content.

(*Lambert*, column 32, lines 12-18). Thus, *Lambert* discloses a caching server marking content as expired and assigning an expiration date to content, and an origin site telling the server what the expiration date is based on knowledge of the content. There is simply no indication in *Lambert* that an expiration command is generated at a data center manager in response to a data change message that is generated by a trigger associated with a data source in response to a change in the data. Even assuming for the sake of argument that *Lambert* implicitly discloses the generation of an expiration command, it is certainly not in response to a data change message. And merely telling a server the expiration date of content based on knowledge of the content is distinguishable from a data change message.

Zhang also does not disclose these limitations. *Zhang* does disclose that "a determination is made if the requested content within the cache 70 is expired, such as by evaluating the information within [an] expires header 76, for example." (*Zhang*, column 9, lines 14-18.) However, the expires header 76 of *Zhang* is sent with the content, and is not generated in response to a data change message. For at least these reasons, the *Lambert-Zhang* combination suggested by the Examiner fails to disclose the limitations specifically recited in Applicants' independent Claim 1, as amended. Reconsideration and allowance of independent Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

With respect to independent Claims 24 and 27, as amended, Applicants submit that these claims are allowable for reasons analogous to those above in conjunction with Claim 1. In addition, Claim 24 is allowable because neither *Lambert* nor *Zhang* discloses, teaches, or suggests that the data change message is received before expiration of the dynamic content item. In each of *Lambert* and *Zhang*, validation of content occurs after expiration of the content.

Dependent Claims 2-16 and 18-23 depend from independent Claim 1, dependent Claims 25-26 depend from independent Claim 24, and dependent Claims 28-29 depend from independent Claim 27. These claims are also not rendered obvious by the *Lambert-Zhang* combination because they include the limitations of their respective base claim as well as an additional limitations that further distinguish *Lambert* and *Zhang*. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all the pending claims.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this case in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact Thomas A. Beaton, the Attorney for Applicants, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6464.

Although Applicants believe no fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Thomas A. Beaton
Reg. No. 46,543

Date: 2/7/05

Correspondence Address:

Customer No.: **05073**